



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

BY JIUJI G. KASAI,

Harvard University.

When the sea-captains of Salem and Boston brought home silks, teas and spices from the Orient; and when the American mariners sailed the seas of Japan in search of whales, it became necessary for the United States to open the secluded empire of Japan which had been kept in isolation for three hundred years. The subsequent rise of American commerce in the Far East at once attracted the attention of the American statesmen. In 1832 when Edmund Roberts was appointed by President Jackson as an "agent for the purpose of examining in the Indian Ocean the means of extending the commerce of the United States by commercial arrangements with the powers whose dominions border on those seas," he was instructed to obtain "information respecting Japan, the means of opening a communication with it," and to seek to establish official relations with the island empire. In 1833 he concluded the treaties of amity and commerce with Siam and Muscat, but the prospect was so unfavorable that he did not attempt to visit Japan. When he left Washington in 1835, on his second visit to the Orient to exchange the ratifications of the treaties he had concluded with Siam and Muscat, he carried with him a message of President Jackson to the Emperor of Japan, and a considerable collection of presents. But Roberts died in Macao in 1836, and his squadron returned to the United States without reaching Japan.

From that time on, several attempts were made by the United States to open Japan until finally President Millard Fillmore sent Commodore M. C. Perry with his message to the Emperor of Japan, with the object of negotiating a treaty to secure "friendship, commerce, a supply of coal and provisions, and the protection of our shipwrecked people." When, on July 8, 1853, Commodore Perry's "black squadron" appeared in the Bay of Yedo, the people of the whole empire were panic-stricken, and the government of the Tokugawa Shogun was paralyzed with fear. Seeing the gravity of the

situation the Shogun's government refused to treat with the American envoy, and Perry left Uraga on condition that he would return the following spring for a reply. In the meantime the statesmen of Japan were seriously discussing the need of the opening of the country, realizing that Japan could no longer keep herself isolated from the incoming "barbarians." With a reinforced fleet of three steam frigates, four sloops of war and two store ships, all cleared for action, Commodore Perry reappeared in the Bay of Yedo in February, 1854, with his strong determination "to demand as a right, not to solicit as a favor, those acts of courtesy which are due from one civilized nation to another—due to the dignity of the American flag."

After careful deliberations, the Shogun's government appointed Hayashi-Daigakunokami and three other commissioners to treat with Perry. Thus, on March 31, 1854, the first treaty Japan had ever negotiated with a foreign nation in the nineteenth century was formally signed at Kanagawa by the representatives of the United States and Japan. The coming of Commodore Perry, therefore, marked a new epoch in the history of modern Japan. By his firm demands and persistent efforts, American diplomacy won the first triumph in the dealings with the island empire.

In the treaty of Kanagawa, it was provided that the two ports of Shimoda and Hakodate be opened to the visit of American citizens, where they would enjoy more freedom than did the Dutch at Nagasaki. To improve this treaty, in 1857 Townsend Harris came to Shimoda as the first American consul-general, and on July 17 he concluded with the government of the Shogun a treaty regulating the commercial relations with Japan. In the following year the treaty of Yedo was signed on July 29, by which the United States secured the rights of trade and residence for her citizens, low import duties and the privilege of extra territoriality to her citizens in Japan. By his honest diplomacy and wise counsel Harris won the confidence of the Japanese nation, and he left the deepest impression of America's goodwill in the hearts of the Japanese people.

Such is the brief account of America's introduction of Japan into the comity of nations. From that time on, the United States has befriended Japan against the perils of foreign aggression, and Japan, in turn, has revered America as her teacher and true friend. When the island empire fought against the mighty Russian colossus upon

the arena of Manchuria, the American people gave moral support to Japan, by their constant sympathy. But unfortunately when the titanic struggle was over, and we had hardly fulfilled the hopes and expectations of the liberty-loving American people, there came the cries of jingoes and demagogues: "Beware of Japan's warlike ambition to master the Pacific at the expense of the United States." The rise of Japan was looked upon with jealousy and suspicion in some quarters, and the friendly feeling of the American people seemed to have suddenly changed into a hostile attitude toward Japan.

At this juncture, the "school question" of San Francisco was fomented through the connivance of Mayor Schmitz of San Francisco, and O. L. Tviemoe, one of the notorious leaders of the MacNamara dynamite conspiracy. Less than one hundred innocent Japanese school children scattered in the public schools of San Francisco were made the targets of the merciless anti-Japanese labor union men, and the bogey of the "Japanese invasion" was created to threaten the minds of the American people. Tviemoe thereupon organized the Japanese-Korean Exclusion League, and sent walking delegates to Portland, Seattle, Bellingham and even to Vancouver, B. C., to create an anti-Japanese movement; and they have used, since then, every means to stir up hatred against the Japanese in the United States. President Roosevelt used strong words to deter the anti-Japanese agitators in California, but all in vain. Thus, the "school question" was employed by these agitators as a means of open insult to the Japanese. Thereupon, the Japanese government sent Baron Ishii, the present ambassador to France, then the head of the bureau of commerce in the department of foreign affairs, to the Hawaiian Islands, and the Pacific coast states to investigate the condition of the Japanese. In the course of his investigation Baron Ishii witnessed how his countrymen were treated with injustice and humiliation in a certain part of the United States. While the question was still pending, on December 4, 1906, President Roosevelt in his message to Congress paid high praise to Japanese civilization and culture and recommended to Congress that "an act be passed specially providing for the naturalization of Japanese who come here intending to become American citizens." Later, immigration regulations were made by which the Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands, Canada and Mexico were prohibited from entering the United States. Finally, Japan was forced to enter into a "gentleman's agreement"

by which she should henceforth prohibit her laborers from coming to the United States.

The popular feeling in Japan ran high to see such injustice and discriminations against the Japanese in the United States, and the weak and submissive policy of the Japanese government invited severe criticism of the people. When an interpellation was made in the Japanese parliament as regards the government's American policy, the late Count Komura, then minister of foreign affairs spoke on February 2, 1909, as follows:

As regards the question of measures unfavorable to the Japanese which are pending in the California legislature, the imperial government, relying upon the sense of justice of the American people as well as the friendly disposition of the federal government, confidently hopes that such questions will not lead to any international complications.

Several cabinets have come into existence and ministers have been changed since this pronouncement of Count Komura, yet the Japanese government has been uniformly consistent in her traditional policy toward the United States. The Japanese people on the other hand have hoped to receive justice from the United States which for the last sixty years has been their friend, and which has sent them missionaries to preach justice and equality; but they have been bitterly disappointed.

While the Japanese-American relations were not improved to an appreciable degree, the Panama-Pacific exposition bill passed Congress, and San Francisco was chosen as the site of the fair. Seeing that the success or failure of the exposition depended largely upon Japan's willingness or unwillingness to participate, the directors of the exposition sent special commissioners to persuade the Japanese government to take an active part in the fair. They assured the authorities in Tokio that although California, through some undesirable elements, had repeatedly humiliated the Japanese, they would see that thereafter no such discriminations should be made against the Japanese. Thereupon, the Japanese government voted one million dollars to participate in the exposition and to build a lasting monument to present to the city of San Francisco after the fair, and sent commissioners to choose the site for the buildings. But no sooner had the friendly voice of those American commissioners of the exposition given proof of genuine friendship of the American

people, than the anti-Japanese measure was again introduced in the legislature at Sacramento. Although President Wilson sent his peace-loving secretary of state to Sacramento to prevent the passage of any legislation hostile to the Japanese which would mean an affront to a friendly nation, Governor Johnson with his defiant attitude turned a deaf ear to the supplication of the chief executive of this great nation. The Webb bill was passed and the Japanese were prohibited from owning land in California. Mr. Bryan returned to Washington without being able to accomplish the purpose of his mission. With the agreement of the anti-Japanese leaders in California Mr. Bryan recommended the appointment of Mr. Caminetti, the most anti-Japanese member of the California senate, as commissioner-general of immigration, and he, since his appointment, has made wholesale accusations against the Japanese and has made most stringent immigration regulations particularly against the Japanese.

Already a year has gone by since the passage of the alien land act which is aimed at the Japanese, but no satisfactory solution has been reached by the two governments. Japan has been very frank and sincere in dealing with the California question. What she wants is honor and justice; and to receive, in the words of Commodore Perry when he opened Japan, "those acts of courtesy which are due from one civilized nation to another." Beyond this she has claimed nothing. Yet there are many writers in this country who have maliciously asserted that Japan has shown the mailed fist to bluff the American government. I ask these people to read the history of the anti-Japanese agitation for the last ten years with their own eyes and without prejudice. The following statement of Prof. J. H. Latané of Johns Hopkins University, in his convocation address at the University of Chicago, August 29, 1913, apropos of this question, represents this class, and would hardly bear honest analysis: "Japan is merely taking advantage of our present embarrassment to extort from us certain concessions. In this she displays greater shrewdness than wisdom. It would be a serious mistake, therefore, for the United States to yield to the Japanese pressure." To such a charge no reply is necessary.

There is another serious misapprehension in the minds of the American people, that is the supposed danger of coolie labor undermining the wage system of this country. As a matter of fact no

"coolies" have ever immigrated into the United States from Japan. The Japanese government has always issued passports to her subjects who have come to the United States, and the standard of qualification of the applicant was so high that no one without some education and means could procure a passport. The Japanese immigration cannot be classed with the Chinese coolie laborer. It can be safely stated that the Japanese immigrants are far superior not only to other Asiatics but also to the immigrants from many European countries. Moreover since Japan has entered into the "gentleman's agreement" the regulation has been so stringent that it is almost impossible for even a student to procure a passport to come to the United States for study. When we think of the American-Japanese relations and consider that many Japanese students who have studied in the United States have always been the best ambassadors that America could send to Japan, it is lamentable for the comity of the two nations that these youths of high ambition are prevented from coming. Thus the number of the Japanese in the United States decreased tremendously since the "gentleman's agreement." According to the report of the commissioner-general of immigration of the United States, the total number of the Japanese of all classes entering the Hawaiian Islands and the continental United States for the five years ending June 30, 1913, was 23,496, while those returned to Japan during the same period numbered 46,209, thus showing an actual decrease of 22,709 in these five years. Does this look as though the "Japanese invasion" were imminent?

It is alleged also that the Japanese laborers in California crowd out the white men from the farm with cheap labor. But, according to the report of Mr. John D. Mackenzie, the commissioner of labor of the state of California, the average daily wage paid to the Japanese laborers in agriculture is \$1.49 with board, and \$1.54 without, while that of white help is \$1.38 with board, and \$1.80 without. The average daily wage of the Japanese laborers employed by the Japanese farmers is \$1.75 with board. Mr. Mackenzie went still further in saying that the skill and efficiency of the Japanese laborers are without equal, and California needs Japanese labor. It has been alleged that the Japanese would own all the fertile land in California. But, out of their patience and toil the Japanese farmers in California have bought only 26,707 acres out of 17,750,000 acres of arable land in that state, —less than one-seventh of one per cent.

Such has been the attitude of the United States toward the Japanese in America. While she has been erecting barriers against the Japanese upon her own soil, and is trying to extend the time-honored Monroe Doctrine to the Far East, she is using her aggressive policy in eastern Asia, to cope with Japanese expansion and development in that part of the world. Japan on the other hand feels that she has an inalienable right in the Far East to preserve her superior position, and to take any course of action required for her self-preservation and defense. But she has no intentions of extending her political sphere upon the western hemisphere. Although Japan has no political intentions in Mexico, the Lodge resolution was passed in the Senate early in 1912, when a certain jingo created the "Magdalena Bay" affair, in order that he might make a fortune by selling a barren land of lichens at a high price. In regard to Mexico, Japan has been extremely cautious not to injure the feelings of the United States. The Japanese government has never tried to have an iota of political control over any bays or harbors in Mexico or in any other part of this continent.¹

In regard to Japan's Manchurian policy, she has strictly adhered to the principles of the "open door" and equal opportunity. She has never used any discriminating policy against foreign merchants, as has been so frequently alleged, by charging higher tariffs or railway rates than she has charged her own nationals. By her proximity to the market, cheaper transportation, better banking facilities, and superior knowledge of the needs and taste of her customers, Japan has been able to compete successfully with foreign merchants in Manchuria. Moreover, it is patent that international trade is exchange—the exchange of the products of one country with those of another. So with the trade between Manchuria and Japan. Japan, being the only importer of the soya bean, the chief agricultural product of Manchuria, in return exports cotton manufactures from her factories. In discussing the trade relations with Manchuria, Dr. Toyokichi Iyenaga, former professorial lecturer of the University of Chicago, says:

It is in the trade of cotton goods alone that Japan has played the rôle of a successful competitor of America. Japan has developed the trade in Man-

¹ Just recently, although she was asked to take charge of the Mexican embassy at Washington by General Huerta, she declined because of her friendly attitude toward the United States.

churia from nothing in 1900 to 151,400 pieces of sheeting, 52,000 pieces of drill and 1800 pieces of shirting in 1908, while the American trade of 1,140,620 pieces of sheeting and 442,291 pieces of drill in 1904 has dropped to 515,195 pieces of sheeting, and 194,570 pieces of drill, in 1908.

Further it must be added with emphasis that, if the American cotton industry has suffered to some extent in Manchuria by the Japanese competition, the American cotton growers have by no means been losers. The raw cotton imported in 1910 from the United States to supply Japanese cotton mills was valued at 17,193,128 yen. The American cotton import of 1911 reached a phenomenal value of 60,000,000 yen! We can see no reason why the cause of manufacturers alone should find its defenders, while that of the farmers is left unnoticed.

It is unfortunate to recall the proposal of Secretary Knox to Japan to neutralize the South Manchurian Railway. It was condemned at that time alike by American public opinion and by the Japanese people. This suggested policy, according to Dr. David Starr Jordan, chancellor of Leland Stanford Junior University, was "personal only—was never acted upon, never approved by the American people and no official action was ever based upon it." Next appeared a scheme of American capitalists to build the Chinchow-Aigun Railway as a rival to the South Manchurian Railway. It was followed by the proposal of the four power loan of \$50,000,000, the interest to be guaranteed by all the unhypothecated resources of Manchuria and with the provision that China should come to the four powers for future loans, thus dethroning Japan from her primacy in Manchuria. To Japan, Manchuria is hallowed ground. Upon this plain, twice she fought for the sake of her national existence. Two billion yens of her treasure were spent, and the precious blood of one hundred and thirty thousand of her noblest sons was shed for the honor of their beloved Nippon. After the glorious victories at Nanshan, Port Arthur, Lioyang and Mukden, at such an enormous cost of blood and treasure, what has Japan received as the trophies of war? Only 750 miles of railways in South Manchuria, and the lease of the Kwintang province of 1,303 square miles! What answer could Secretary Knox logically expect from Japan? How could Japan be expected to give up the precious prize at the suggestion of a nation which has no vital interests in Manchuria and no comprehension of the deep problems there involved, and has never sacrificed a penny of her treasure or a drop of her blood?

In discussing the policy of Secretary Knox, Mr. Hamilton Holt, editor of the *Independent*, says:

Our attitude in respect to Manchuria was very much the same as though Japan went to our border state Mexico and said: "See here, Mexico, the United States has a good deal of money invested in your territory. It is a menace to your integrity. We suggest that you let us raise a loan, so that you can pay the United States what you owe her and then tell her to get out. You can come to us only for *all* future loans." If such a proposition were made by Japan to Mexico nearly every editor in the United States would be shrieking for war. But the Japanese are very self-controlled people. They say very little. They feel, however, that they have the same right in eastern Asia that we claim in this hemisphere under the Monroe Doctrine, that is an inalienable right to take any proper course requisite for self-preservation.

Thus, this "great blunder" of Knox's diplomacy has served to bring Russia and Japan together for the mutual protection of their property and interests in Manchuria. Japan defended only her true rights when she refused this proposal. She has justly acquired those rights by the treaty of Portsmouth, and by the treaty of Peking of December 22, 1905. She will never relinquish those interests and rights, but will protect them with all her might. But these have nothing to do with the "open door" policy; Japan has always adhered to the principle of equal opportunity, and she will ever maintain that principle.

While the attitude of Japan toward the United States has been very frank, yet from my personal observations, I am inclined to believe that the policy of the United States toward Japan has undergone a complete change since the time of the Russo-Japanese war. Prof. Sidney L. Gulick of Doshisha University, Kioto, who has lived in Japan more than thirty years, in his recent work, *American-Japanese Problems*, says:

The present Oriental policy of the United States as a whole is, in important respects, humiliating to the Oriental and disgraceful to us. Professing friendship in words, we deny it in important deeds. Demanding an open door for Americans in Asia and equality of opportunity for our citizens with that accorded to citizens of the "most favored nation," we do not ourselves grant these same things to Asiatics in our land.

In summarizing, then, Japan's attitude toward the United States has always been one of extreme friendliness. She has always respected America with that sense of reverence which is characteristic of that island empire. There is no fear on the part of the United States of the so-called "Japan's aggressive policy." It is to the United States that Japan has been turning to bring about a better

solution, and her people have been asking for justice and honor. Japan has struggled for the last sixty years to win the right to stand abreast of the most enlightened nations of the world, and she has by her own exertions won "the right to treatment on a basis of full and frank equality." Will America, that has proudly watched the growth of the island empire during the last half century, now turn to be a *provocateur* to wound eternally the heart of the nation heretofore filled with deepest gratitude? Justice is the basis of international amity and peace. May America ever be true to her praiseworthy traditions of freedom and justice. May the scholars and statesmen of the United States study the Japanese questions dispassionately, free from bigotry and prejudice, and realize that justice is the plea of the Japanese in America and of the nation across the sea. On the high plane of justice and mutual respect alone can our traditional friendship be strengthened in the future as it has so happily prospered in the past.